

11 March 1965

Joe;

RE: HR 4845 (Brooks Bill - 89th Congress, 1st Session)

Ref: Memo from J.S. Warner, LC to AD/CS, 4 Mar 65, HR 4845

1. The referenced memo states three alternatives to assure that the proposed legislation on ADP matters does not impair the Agency's program:

a. "to work for a specific Agency exemption in this bill": At the committee hearings on HIR 5171 (1963 version of HR 4845) most government agencies seemed to be claiming rights for exemption from such a bill, i. e. that such legislation would have a harmful effect on their agency programs.

b. "to suggest language changes necessary to satisfy our requirements without specifically exempting the Agency." HR 4845 states (see Reference, para 4a) that whereas the Administrator GSA is to determine when to delegate authority for reasons of "efficiency and economy," this is not the case "when such action is essential to national defense or national security." Who does determine when and how much authority is to be delegated in the case of national security?

c. "to obtain assurances that GSA can and will delegate whatever authority is needed by us to preserve the integrity of our program". The problem is to get "assurances" without a specific exemption ("a" above) or satisfactory language ("b" above) in the bill.

2. The legal strategy to support our interests is up to OGC/LC. OCS favors some degree of government-wide management centralization for ADP. The route BOB has laid out in the past has presented problems only because of weak inhouse support on ADP managerial problems. We favor a bill that will provide for centralized guidance, support, and standardization of things ADP. However, the Agency's programs cannot survive in an ADP jungle. I expect that security is our strongest valid crutch for an end run. If played right, 4845 should help us to strengthen our in-house ADP management and bolster our Agency program.



STAT

STAT